DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 092 637 UD 014 244

AUTHOR Elsbery, James W.
TITLE A Final Report of the Brownsville Community Council's Advocacy Planning Unit.
INSTITUTION Center for Urban Education, New York, N.Y.
PUB DATE Mar 72
NOTE 90p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.75 HC-$4.20 PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS *Advisory Committees; *Community Agencies (Public); Community Change; Community Consultant Programs; Community Development; *Community Planning; Community Problems; Community Programs; Community Resources; Educational Problems; Health Programs; *Inner City; Interagency Cooperation; Site Selection
IDENTIFIERS *New York City

ABSTRACT

The primary purpose of this analysis is to report on the application of a form of advocacy planning in an inner-city community and then determine how much of what has been learned is relevant to other urban settings that need sociopolitical change. The Brownsville Community Council is one of 26 community development corporations created throughout New York City. These corporations are the backbone of community development in New York City, receiving allocations from the Council Against Poverty, a subdivision of the Human Resources Administration of the City of New York. The Advocacy Planning Unit has three primary functions in relationship to the BCC. The first is to assist the BCC in determining and articulating its priorities as an organization. The second function is to devise procedural guidelines that would enable the BCC to capitalize more fully on the resources available to it. Its third function is to advise the community of the pathways through the maze created by government. The Planning Unit assists the BCC in identifying, determining, and articulating priorities. Because it is cognizant of the council's procedures, it can also propose plans that will enable the BCC to tackle problems that it had formerly not been able to undertake. (Author/JM)

F5

ED 092637

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

A FINAL REPORT OF THE BROWNSVILLE COMMUNITY COUNCIL'S ADVOCACY PLANNING UNIT

Prepared by

JAMES W. ELSBERY, Ph.D.

With the assistance of

Jeffrey Silbert
and
Christopher Thompson

March 1972

UD 014244

The Center for Urban Education
105 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y. 10016

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS.....TC-1

PREFACE..... P-1

CHAPTER I
HISTORY AND BACKGROUND OF ADVOCACY PLANNING..... 1

Approaches..... 1
Some Examples..... 5
Case I..... 5
Case II..... 6
Case III..... 7
Case IV..... 8
Case V..... 10
Analysis of Cases..... 10
Summary 13

CHAPTER II
ADVOCACY PLANNING AND THE BCC..... 15

SocioHistorical Goals of Advocacy Planning..... 15
Advocacy Planning and the NIMH..... 16
Advocacy Planning and the BCC..... 18
Functions of the Advocacy Planning Unit..... 20
BCC's Perceptions of Advocacy Planning 23
Formal Structure of the BCC..... 25

Advocacy Planning Unit..... 29

Agendas and Meetings..... 29
Formal Communication..... 30
Informal Communication..... 30
Conflicts..... 30

CHAPTER III
DEMOGRAPHY OF BROWNSVILLE..... 32

CHAPTER IV
ADVOCACY PLANNING UNIT ACTIVITIES..... 37

Theoretical Designs and Matrices..... 37
Human Resource Bank..... 39
Education..... 40
Health..... 41
Community Development Agency..... 42
Cultural Programs..... 43

CHAPTER IV (Cont.)

Economic Conditions..... 43
Preschool Program..... 47
Cooperation with Other Agencies..... 47
Perceptions of the BCC and AFU by City Employees in Brownsville..... 49
Table 1
Selected Characteristics of Firemen in Brownsville Community..... 51
Attitudes of Community Citizens..... 54
Report of Advocacy Planning's Effectiveness..... 54

CONCLUSIONS OF REPLICABLE IMPORTANCE..... 58

FOOTNOTES

Chapter I.....FN-1
Chapter II.....FN-3
Chapter IV.....FN-4

APPENDICES

Appendix A
Progress Report, May 31, 1971..... A-1
Appendix B
Questionnaire..... B-1

BIBLIOGRAPHY.....BIB-1

PREFACE

As stated in the interim report submitted to and accepted by the NIMH (see Appendix A) this evaluation is based upon a sociohistorical model. According to this model, a program is reviewed from its inception, within a particular sociohistorical context, through its linear time process sequence. In the process, both qualitative and quantitative data are given their appropriate significance. Generally, the designer or analyzer or writer of the project makes limited value distinctions between hard and soft data, in the belief that any difference between the two is based upon a supposed superiority of technical instruments in measuring one kind of data and its significance. The author maintains, however, that such instruments are often faulty, unreliable, and rarely comparable when working in the relatively new field of community research. Usually each new project evaluated, equipped as it must be with its own questionnaires tests, hypothesis, research design, methods of data collecting, and type of data collected, becomes unusable by others. All these factors limit comparability and influence reliability and validity. Above all, as noted in the interim report, the variables and their interrelationships that affect a community project are often multitudinous in number and complicated in cause and effect.

This document, based on these beliefs and on the sociohistorical model employed, is by and large narrative in form and utilizes tables only when appropriate. Statistical analysis in this kind of study has limited value, if any, even if partial correlations were employed. Consequently, determining whether or not parametric or nonparametric

analysis is appropriate would be an unnecessary first step. There is nothing "clean" in this study and to employ such an analysis would be exploiting technical tools for effect rather than for true enlightenment. Is is hoped that studies like this will aid our search for tools to provide a valid and reliable means of collecting, organizing and analyzing community-research data. This does not mean that some statistical tools cannot be used here and there at appropriate spots. What should be emphasized is that too often statistical tools are inappropriately employed as if we were studying rats under test chamber conditions or students in psychology classes rather than multi-faceted, action-oriented, inner-city urban communities.

The primary purpose of this analysis is to report on the application of a form of advocacy planning in an inner-city community and then determine how much of what has been learned is relevant to other urban settings that need sociopolitical change.

CHAPTER I

HISTORY AND BACKGROUND OF ADVOCACY PLANNING

The 1960's was a period in which the upsurge of the civil rights movement again reflected the frustrations and despair of urban as well as rural blacks, poor whites, and other minority groups. Eruptions in the cities, in particular, were partially responsible for forcing social planners to begin to reevaluate their roles.

Approaches

Before the rash of urban explosions of the 1960's, it had been the consensus among professional planners that planning for the welfare of minorities was deserving of their attention. The planning process, however, was so structured that full participation on the part of any citizen affected by these planners was discouraged. In this period, planners believe that a unitary plan was necessary. A unitary plan is one in which overall responsibility for development of a comprehensive plan is vested in the hands of one politically responsible agency. Unfortunately, in most cases of planning for a community, this approach was interpreted to mean that the needed community agency was a City Planning Commission or department.[1]

As it began to emerge in the 1960's, the planning process incorporated the concept of democracy. Planners for urban government sought to include the deprived urban dwellers. "Inclusion means not only permitting the citizen to be heard. It also means that he is able to become well informed about the underlying reasons for planning proposals, and be able to respond to them in the technical language of professional planners."[2]

But the violence of that decade--Watts, Detroit, Chicago, Philadelphia, Milwaukee, and many other urban centers exploding into riots, arson, and looting--created an impetus for an incisive and penetrating reinterpretation of the true meaning of "community" planning. The result was the development of a pluralistic approach that enhanced community input into the public planning agency, thus creating a forum for a pluralistic consensus of ideas and strategies. The public planning agency was by no means relieved of its responsibility to formulate plans for improvement of urban centers; it was reoriented in order to be able to share the planning function with other community sources, thereby reducing the possibility of shallow analysis of potential directions or community nonparticipation.[3]

"Advocacy planning, one form of social planning, has its origins initially in the perception that groups need planners to make their case, to express their interests."[4] The question invariably asked is: What particular approach do the planners employ in fulfilling their advocate planning role? Advocacy planning is not a new phenomena, though up to the 1960's and 1970's, professional planners did not engage in it to any great extent. In most cases the work was done by trained community organizers or student groups.[5]

The term "advocacy" originated in the legal profession. As Dr. Frances Piven observed:

> The older legal-defense organizations have begun to take test cases challenging the regulating and practices of agencies serving the poor, and new organizations have sprung up to offer free legal services. Social workers are also active, stationing themselves in storefronts to attract a "Walk in Clientele," acting as their advocates by badgering the public agencies for services. And recently planners and architects have begun offering services to the local groups affected by neighborhood redevelopment proposals.[6]

Professional proponents of this more recent approach to planning say that their advocacy reflects an increasing unease with their professions' handling of urban renewal and urban redevelopment plans.[7] These plans led to the devastations of neighborhoods and the uprooting of essentially the poor and nonwhite populations in the cities.

Early advocates were undoubtedly stirred by the civil rights movement and the urban rebellions. The social consciousness of urban America was vividly exposed to the increasing concentrations of black, Spanish, and white poverty in its midst. As Piven wrote in 1969:

> Volunteer efforts were scattershot and unimportant. Advocacy has become a popular idea, and may even become a widespread form of professional practice because opportunities for advocate practice have been created by the array of federal programs for the inner cities launched during the 60's. First social workers and lawyers were hired by federally funded projects in delinquency, mental health, education and poverty; and now advocate planning is also likely to become both popular and feasible as a result of funds provided by model cities programs. In our enthusiasm for the idea, we have tended to see these advocates as independent because they are independent from local governments, ignoring the federal dollars which support them and the federal interest they serve.[8]

The late Clarence Funnye, president of Funnye Associates, Inc., a planning firm in Brooklyn, viewed the advocate planner as an "urban hustler" whose views of what ought to be done for the poor are necessarily colored by his conditioning in a basically racist society. He confirmed Piven's analysis:

> Piven is right on target in identifying the motives behind poverty programs and Model Cities. The Democratic Administration of Kennedy and Johnson provided an Urban Goldmine in both monetary and status terms, for white social scientists and a variety of urban specialists, who had become experts on urban problems, do studies, write books and give speeches. Blacks and the urban poor by their protests created the climate and formed the raw materials for a very well paying urban industry.[9]

Piven and Funnye leave no doubt that the change in social consciousness which was conceptualized in a generalized democratic humanitarian manner could also be converted into a hoax played on the already shackled urban dweller.

The change in approach by advocate planners did not take place in a quiescent sociopolitical atmosphere. Their refocusing in fact took place at a time when traditional planning agents were coming under much fire. The movement for change was helped by the influx of federal funds and by the government's receptivity to the new approach of advocacy planning.

In an article titled, "Some Thoughts on Advocacy Planning," Richard Hatch summarized the need for change:

> We have seen the failure of the first era of public redevelopment in the convulsions of our cities, which become more frequent and dangerous each spring; and we are forced, along with Senators Ribicoff and Kennedy, H.U.D. officials, and the radical new left, to admit that failure was not one of means or communication, but of moral imagination and political leadership. We set out to destroy the homes of the poor. We set out to bring the middle class (whites) back to the cities. We set out to preserve and enhance land value and tax receipts. To the extent that we have been successful in these attempts we have failed the poor and widened the breach between rich and poor, black and white which threatens the future of our domestic institutions....For generations we have had white schools, stores, clinics and designs; we must have their black counterparts. A respect for these special psychological needs and a sense of guilt at the disservice which the architectural and planning professions have done to the poor underlies the new profession of advocacy.[10]

Today's advocate planner must serve also as an advocate for the poor. If his labors are to be fruitful and meaningful then he must plan for granting power to the poor. He must plan for political and social change that will provide the means for a community's self-determination.

He must assist the community in perceiving, understanding, and reorganizing the workings of its system. The planner helps the community direct its energies toward the realization of both short- and long-range goals that it defines in the planning process.[11] As Piven implies, if the advocate planners do not work for the self-determination of the communities they serve, then American cities may conceivably be in graver difficulty in the future than they are now.

Today inner cities are in physical and economic trouble. Declining tax bases accompanied by increased welfare rolls and expanded need for services call for a more heterogeneous group of planners. Such planners will need expertise in effectively articulating agreed-upon solutions for problems of providing services and improving general conditions of life in our urban environments.

In an attempt to classify advocacy planning, a number of projects typifying the most usual advocate planning functions and allegiances are presented in this report: The New York City Cooper Square Plan and project; Architects Renewal Committee on Harlem; the Harlem Community project; and two cases in Brownsville (Brooklyn).[12] In addition, several national case studies of advocacy planning projects are offered below for purposes of analysis.

Some Examples

Case I

In Boston, Massachusetts, the Lower Roxbury Community Committee (LRCC) and the Urban Planning Aid (UPA), headquartered in Cambridge, Massachusetts, joined forces in an effort to prevent the Boston Redevelopment Authority from razing a sizable portion of the Lower

Roxbury community for the purpose of building a large campus high school. If executed as planned, the prime effect of the project would have been a mass dislocation of community residents. The initial plans supplemented by a scheme for a projected highway would have completely altered the community's physical ecology and socioeconomic composition. Furthermore, none of the existing residents would have derived any benefits from the completed project in terms of accessibility to the high school.

The LRCC, with its membership of community residents, a majority of whom had greater economic and social stability than the group threatened with dislocation, acted as the client for UPA. LRCC in cooperation with UPA conducted a series of surveys to determine the community's needs and desires. Following these surveys, LRCC held a series of mass meetings that were well attended.[13]

UPA in turn provided technical services to LRCC in various aspects of planning and community organization. Through these different forms of assistance, the community was able to organize and voice demands for needed housing and other improvements not included in the original plan developed by the Boston Redevelopment Authority. Mass dislocation was averted in favor of a plan conceived and developed by LRCC and UPA and accepted as an alternative by the Boston Redevelopment Authority.

Case II

Hunter's Point, an area on the southeastern edge of San Francisco, contains some barrack-type buildings built and used during World War II to house shipyard workers. The San Francisco Redevelopment Agency initiated the planning of a Title I urban renewal project.

A joint housing committee, composed of residents of the Hunter's Point area, formed the Bayview Hunter's Point Nonprofit Community Development Corporation (BHPNCDC). The group had requested help in reviewing the proposed plans and in developing alternative ones where practicable. Committee members felt that the city was not providing them with the necessary skilled technicians to express their viewpoints, and it was feared that the committee would therefore be coopted or at least forced to accept any plan set before it because of its inability to translate its own point of view into a comprehensive plan.

When BHPNCDC asked the planning firm of Marshall, Kaplan, Gans, and Hakn to provide technical assistance, the firm submitted a report that included suggestions for a community-owned housing development on ten acres of vacant land in the proposed Title I survey area. Before accepting or rejecting the report, BHPNCDC requested that it be released in order to elicit public dialogue on the political, social, and economic issues surrounding the proposed project. This action resulted in two major accomplishments: (1) all facets and information about the planning process for the survey plan were exposed to both the public and the Redevelopment Agency director; (2) needed alliances and coalitions were cemented among groups involved in the debate. Flowing from these achievements, certain trade-offs and concessions were made by the client group and the city Redevelopment Agency concluding with a plan amenable to all.[14]

Case III

In Oakland, California, located across the bay from San Francisco, the planning firm of Marshall, Kaplan, Gans, and Hakn was called in by the Redevelopment Agency director to serve as staff consultants to a newly

formed city council task force. The task force had been created to prepare a Model Cities application that would reinforce the efforts of the Redevelopment Agency to improve the physical ecology of the city without massive relocation or removal of segments of the population.

Surveys conducted in the essentially black community and evaluations of existing data on other Model Cities and urban renewal projects led the planners to conclude that relocation should be minimized as much as possible. Because of time constraints set by HUD (four months from publication of criteria to submission of proposal) the methodology used to collect data was to "rely on interviews for initial priority definitions and the Community Action Agencies for dialogue and ultimate resident ratification."[15] The frustrations and tensions experienced by community residents as a result of their participation, or attempts at participation, in the planning process caused a deeper division than already existed between the members of the black community and the City Hall officials.

Case IV

New York City devised a linear city proposal, which included developing an integrated educational complex in or near Brownsville, Brooklyn, New York City. "A plan for a new junior high school was submitted to be built on the fringe between the Brownsville community and neighboring white communities in order to provide a well integrated school population."[16] The Brownsville Council on Youth sparked the issue by initiating a campaign to organize the community behind the issue of integration of JHS 275. It was supported and assisted during this period by local residents, professional Brownsville Community Council (BCC)

or Advocacy Planning Project service workers, the Parent Workshop for Equality of New York City schools, and others.

BCC was mainly involved in the campaign to get the funds for the construction of JHS 275. The city's plan, the linear city proposal, suggested a housing, industrial, school, and commercial complex, utilizing air rights and parcels of land adjacent to a little used freight line and the proposed Cross Brooklyn Expressway. This proposal was rejected by the political powers, and its intended funds were diverted to another project in another borough of New York City.[17] BCC continued its efforts to get monies released to plan its own school complex. (The present Advocacy Planning Unit was not in existence at the time of these events.) It gradually became obvious that the tactics being used were unsuccessful in forcing city officials to stand by initial commitments to building the school. BCC, after determining that the community had no political representative who could speak for its concerns:

> (1) informed and involved the community in the nature and meaning of the city's plan for the community and began to research, prepare, present, publicize, defend, and win acceptance for its own realistic alternative to city plans.

It also set out to:

> (2) organize the necessary resources and support for its alternative in and out of the community; get volunteer professional assistance or advice in the areas such as demograpy, map making, publicity, law and school planning; organize groups and individuals to support their alternative before city agencies.[18]

Although this campaign failed, it led to a larger campaign for the development of the Flatlands Educational Park "conceived as a middle-school complex also to be built in the fringe area to serve four communities."[19]

Case V

The New York City Planning Commission developed a plan to raze the Cooper Square community and replace it with high-rise apartment buildings and its "partner in progress," a shopping center. Members of the community hired a professional planner to assist them in developing an alternative plan. Those involved in this effort "helped to collect and process relevant survey data, appraised the validity of existing land use attrition and assessed the economic base of the area."[20]

When the two plans were compared, it became perfectly clear that the Commission looked at Cooper Square as just another run-down area and formulated its plan on this premise, at the cost of omitting the unique qualities of the target area.[21] The community's plan, called the Thabit Plan, was finally accepted over that proposed by the City Planning Commission.

Analysis of Cases

A few conceptualizations of advocacy and advocacy planning, together with criticisms, reflections, or comments from the literature on this subject, will help in analyzing and categorizing the preceding cases.

Advocacy planning is of critical importance because frustrated and alienated inner city residents need the kinds of assistance that planners provide. The positive aspects of a functional pluralism within a democratic form of government are self-evident. The fact that the poor, the black, the underprivileged living in a low-income area are without an effective political voice, or without effective representation in the political forum, points to the erosion of democracy in inner city

America and increases drastically the need for selling advocacy to planners as a remedy for some of the more basic social ills of America. Poverty programs have seemingly been institutionalized and so has the role of advocacy planning as it is expressed in community action programs for low-income families. Community action programs and their planners must devise programs to conquer poverty and create healthy social, economic, and political environments, not merely <u>for</u> but <u>with</u> the community.

Davidoff defined advocacy "as the exercise of the planning function on behalf of specified individuals and groups, rather than on behalf of a broadly defined 'public interest.'"[22] The planner working as an advocate of the community in a community action program must be prepared to adopt this approach or his loyalties become questionable. A key aspect of an advocate's function lies in his technical assistance to indigenous community people in developing community-oriented renewal projects--whether social action or highway and street construction projects--as alternatives to those projects developed by unitary-plan-oriented government departments.

Understandably, planners often inadvertently advocate their own points of view in the planning process. The advocate planner must constantly be aware that he has the responsibility of selling his point of view to the group or groups he serves, but that he must finally perform in accordance with the wishes of his employers. Piven spells it out:

> There are many variants of the advocacy idea, but two elements are essential to it: professional services should be so structured as to assure that professionals are responsive to the interests of the poor. In other words, it is not so much that

> professionals have been strangers to the slum, rather, it is that those professionals who do work with slum people and slum problems are under hire by--and therefore responsive to--public and private agencies which represent interests other than those of the poor. There is, of course, a dilemma in this idea, for if professional services are in the end responsive to whoever supports them, where can the poor find the money to pay their advocates?
>
> ...Implicit in planning advocacy is the recognition that planning decisions determine who gets what in the city, and so are also political decisions. But the inevitable result of involving local groups in elaborate planning procedures is to guide them into a narrowly limited form of political participation for which they are ill equipped. What is set out for the poor is a strategy of political action which, to be effective requires stable organization, professional staff, and money--precisely those resources which the poor do not have.[23]

Bernard Frieden adds:

> An important aspect to the philosophy underlying this advocacy function is to end the feelings of dependence and passivity that usually characterize relationships between the poor and the public agencies that provide them with various kinds of services. Efforts are made to assert the rights of the poor to receive public service: the service is not regarded as a favor.[24]

Representation and rights then become the issue and the issue is basic to living in a democratic republic. Frustration, alienation, and despair stem from an inability of the poor and oppressed to assert real rights.[25] Advocacy planning has the potential of combating contradictory aspects of our "democratic" republic by making the ideal a reality.

Widespread mass participation in the planning process is still relatively new, especially in lower socioeconomic neighborhoods. As a type of community planning, advocacy has a much longer history in middle-class communities, where technicians have historically been employed to express community needs and desires.

Organizations and institutions in middle-class areas have traditionally been well organized, well financed, and responsive to the needs, desires, and points of view of their residents. In contrast, lower-class communities have been characterized by poorly organized organizations and by the unresponsiveness of existing institutions to community needs, wants, points of view. Overwhelmed by their efforts to eke out a daily existence, lower-class communities have found it immensely difficult to maintain well-financed and organized institutions that can efficiently advocate their point of view.

Summary

Advocacy planning, as seen in its broad historical perspective, is a response to the established need to tap community desires and goals in the planning process. Our review of the case studies revealed two distinct approaches: One, as exemplified by case studies in Boston, San Francisco, and Cooper Square, New York City, highlights the role of the planner as the representative of the people. The planner articulates the client's ideas and suggests in turn ideas that are acceptable to the client. In these cases the planner has the additional role of "negotiator" between city authorities and local community residents.

The case study of Oakland, California, typifies a second approach. The same firm of planners who were hired in San Francisco were used by the Oakland City Management. The planners did not seek out the needs of the community affected but, based upon their own expertise and that of City Management, developed a plan that management implemented. In this instance, the planner serves as a professional consultant to some governmental structure.

Often the planner's role becomes similar to that of an urban lawyer; his practice, however, does not take him before the different levels of civil or criminal courts. Rather he pleads a case on behalf of his client, sometimes the community, sometimes a subsystem power structure, before the different levels of local, state, or federal financial gatekeeping. In most instances, the planner, like the lawyer, does not pass on his expertise to his client.

A third approach to advocacy planning is seen in the Brownsville Community Council Project. Here the planner is attached to a wide-based organization that is community represented and community elected. The BCC had set up its goals for advocacy planning as follows:

> The planner is to lessen frustration, articulate goals, set priorities, give alternatives, and know the ins and out of inter- and intra-organizational complexes.[26]

In this instance, the planner is a facilitator as well as a resource. He is also attached to a community organizational structure which does represent the people. Therefore, advocacy planning in Brownsville works for a community agency instead of a government one as in the second approach; but, like the planner who works for government agencies, the BCC planner himself does not initiate wide-based support or speak directly of the people's needs. Instead he gives BCC the professional expertise necessary for it to speak for its constituency. The issue is: Can the BCC now better perform its mandated aims and goals?

CHAPTER II

ADVOCACY PLANNING AND THE BCC

According to The American Heritage Dictionary, "advocate" has the following meanings:

> (1) v.t., to plead in favor of; support or urge by argument; recommend publicly; (2) one who defends, vindicates, or espouses a cause by argument; (3) one who pleads for or on behalf of another; intercessor; (4) one who pleads the cause of another in a court of law.[1]

Sociohistorical Goals of Advocacy Planning

The first chapter indicated how advocacy has become associated with the planning process. In some instances, advocacy planning has used only one of the above meanings as its goals for planning. In other cases, it has used more than one.

Two perspectives of advocacy planning were discussed in Chapter I. One perspective was to retain planners on behalf of a community. The planner's role was to articulate strongly but professionally the community's concerns over the establishment's proposed physical changes in the neighborhood. The planner's responsibility was (1) to explain the plan promulgated by the centralized planning body so that community residents might understand it and, (2) if they were dissatisfied, to assist them in developing a counter plan. In this role, the community-retained advocate planners would articulate the counter plan, that of the community, to the centralized planning body.

The other perspective was to have planners retained by a centralized planning body so as to defend or initiate centralized planning, with the

aim of convincing the affected community that the proposed plan was in its own best interests and should therefore be implemented.

The evidence from Chapter I indicates that goals were most successfully attained when advocate planners were retained by the community. This position was a departure from the way things were in the past. Planners were now expected to articulate the concerns, objectives, and feelings of inner city residents; to develop alternatives to the centralized planning body's plans; to articulate the communities' objections to proposed plans.

Advocacy Planning and the NIMH

The goals of advocacy planning have been widely discussed but never studied in any systematic manner. Research conditions were required to understand properly the effectiveness of advocacy planning. The National Institute of Mental Health (NIMH) became interested in applying research and evaluation techniques in the area of advocacy planning. At the suggestion of the Center for Urban Education, it accepted Brownsville and the BCC as an appropriate setting for a three-year study.

> By making the project for BCC, NIMH wanted to gain insight into the role, the process and potential effectiveness of advocacy planning in an organized poverty community. The Institute hoped that the Project's experiences by BCC would permit generalized conclusions under what conditions advocacy planning could be helpful and therefore might be recommended to other communities.[2]

The Institute's rationale may be stated as follows:

A. Poverty creates a feeling of powerlessness.

B. The feeling of powerlessness creates a negative attitude toward opportunities for bringing about desired changes by community action.

C. To help such a community become more effective in efforts geared toward improvements means to counteract this feeling of powerlessness.

D. If successful in counteracting the feeling of powerlessness, it could have the consequence of greater stability by encouraging the local citizens to remain in the community. The decision to stay may result in greater identification with the community and extended participation in its affairs.

E. Such identification with the community will have a positive effect on the mental health of its citizenry.

Underlying these concepts are the implicit aims of advocacy planning. In Statement A, the NIMH sees planners helping to overcome a community's sense of powerlessness. Poverty is viewed not only as physical deterioration but as economic deterioration as well. Within this context, the planner's aim is to initiate and/or guide physical and economic development of the community designated as being poverty-stricken. Statement B relates to the viewpoint that inner city community residents, lacking the sense of accomplishment and/or improvement, become cynical, suspicious, and skeptical about being able to communicate with authority figures and receiving a response to their needs. The planner's aim, therefore, must be to help community residents gain a sense of accomplishment and/or improvement so that they can surmount their feelings of helplessness.

Implicit in Statement C is the idea that combating powerlessness and helplessness is a salient possibility when the planner provides direction and visibility to programs that could induce a change in the status quo. Also implicit is the thesis that the planner can work from within the system to bring about change.

Statement D promulgates the viewpoint that the degree to which the planner is able to surmount the impression of powerlessness on the part of community residents determines how well a cohesive and dynamic community in spirit as well as action can develop. The planner's objective is to elicit community participation in developing and enacting community goals. The community's acting as a unified body leads to an increase in the number of residents participating and in the quality of their participation. The enthusiasm and esprit de corps leads to enhanced identification with the community and its goals.

Statement E has a generalized implied goal. By assisting community residents in moving toward accomplishment of their goals the planner will have a salubrious effect on the mental health of the community. Living in a decent environment, no longer characterized by exceedingly high rates of crime, infant mortality, school dropping out, suicides, drug use, broken families, overcrowded housing, and under-service by public service institutions, an individual will not be as likely to manifest the more severe types of pathological disturbance that now exist.

Let us now examine how the BCC saw advocacy planning and how it intended to utilize it and compare the conceptualization with that of the NIMH.

Advocacy Planning and the BCC

Major R. Owens, the Executive Director of the Brownsville Community Corporation in 1968, and the signatory for that organization's research proposal, titled "Experiment in Community Planning by an Active Ghetto," perceived the goals of the proposed Advocacy Planning Project in these terms:

> Building on the solid but narrow foundations of the BCC committees, the professional planners are expected to reduce the frustration and hopelessness presently being experienced by the staff and committees. The professional planners should be able to: (1) state the issues with greater sharpness and clarity; (2) assist in determining priorities; (3) offer alternative plans for action; (4) provide the necessary skills and resources or advise the BCC on how to get them; (5) clearly state the demands and requirements of government agencies, laws and regulations; and (6) assist committee members in making the most effective use of the regular processes and channels of government.[3]

The NIMH had the following perceptions of the proposed Advocacy Planning Unit and the roles of the planners on its staff:

(a) Proposing, responding to proposals or participating in on-going improvement programs in all areas of community endeavors such as housing, education, recreation, transportation, health facilities and voter registration.

(b) Making decisions on priorities.

(c) Establishing administrative procedures and policies geared toward assuring the effective functioning of the organization.

(d) Dealing with inner-organizational as well as intra-organizational relations.

The NIMH further perceived that:

> Advocacy Planning is a process geared toward enabling a citizenry--among them especially the unrepresented and under-represented--through their own organizations and on their own budget to engage specialists who are planning advisors for the purpose of achieving goals of their activities. These advisors will be responsible to the local community organization which hires them and is their employer.
>
> It is the obligation of such specialist-advisors to render requested services in the area of their expertise. The purpose of these services is to facilitate effective functioning of the organization which engaged them in the pursuit of their goals, to encourage and make possible broad citizen participation in planning as well as in the execution of programs. Additionally, the planners should be responsible for preparing local citizens so that they can function as advocacy planners in the future.[4]

The attitudes and beliefs of two of the parties have been stated, but a third is required: the director of the Advocacy Planning Unit.

Matthew Meade, who was hired by the BCC as Director of the Advocacy Planning Project, expressed its aims and goals as follows:

1. To provide a reservoir of professional talent which would have a catalytic effect on community improvement efforts.

2. To design tools for the restructuring of low-income communities which would bring about an increase in their rate of development.

3. To formulate a general mode of development for urban low-income minorities in industrialized societies.[5]

About advocacy planners he said:

> Advocates have always been around, but form and use of advocates has varied over time and circumstance. The efficient use of advocates in middle class communities and their poor usage in lower class areas make for a significant difference between these two kinds of communities. Near optimal utilization of the specific skills represented by the advocate planners is a definitive indicator of community growth leading towards community development. This is certain to have a positive effect on the mental health of the community. It shows a greater awareness of the potential contribution of advocates, and an increased confidence in their use.[6]

Paul Cooper, the Executive Director of the Brownsville Community Council, stated:

> Advocacy planning is set up to take an overview of the Brownsville Community Corporation. Thus, they function as the advocates of the agency, and move with them in the direction that these programs might decide to go, based on joint input.[7]

Functions of the Advocacy Planning Unit

The aims, goals, and roles for the Advocacy Planning Unit are perceived in essentially similar terms by NIMH, the former and the present Executive Directors of BCC, and the Director of the Advocacy Planning Unit.

As stated in an official report by the Unit's Director, the Advocacy Planning Unit has three primary functions in relationship to the BCC.

The first function of the Unit is to assist the BCC in determining and articulating its priorities as an organization. This particular inner city community, Brownsville, is wracked by the full range of complex multifaceted social, economic, and political problems, which are a major cause of the feeling of powerlessness experience by many of the residents. In the past, when attempts were made to deal with the total range of problems, there was never enough money to go around. A competitive atmosphere developed among community residents and community agencies. The resulting fratricide and internal bickering increased the impressions of hopelessness and helplessness.

The second function of the Advocacy Planning Unit is to devise procedural guidelines that would enable the BCC to capitalize more fully on the resources available to it, both internally and externally. BCC staff develop and initiate programs intended to solve some of the community's problems. Personal involvement and a fanatical commitment to attaining goals very often result in a loss of objectivity and a reduction in the competence of the staff member. The advocate planners, because they are not involved in the day-to-day frustrations of program development and maintenance, can more effectively and objectively evaluate some of the programs, thus increasing the likelihood of goal achievement. At least this was the initial vision.

In an organization as highly structured as the Brownsville Community Council (see pp. 25-29) internal sniping and competition among various program components sometimes result. Each program component views itself as being vital to the organization. What happens,

however, is that sometimes the program components become diffused, forgetting their integral relationship to the total organization and what that organization is trying to achieve. One of Advocacy Planning's goals is to elucidate lines of cooperative effort and commonality of cause between program components. In this way, a more efficient, cohesive, directed campaign can be waged without excessive duplication of effort and repetitive tasks. Cooperative effort increases the visibility of the different program components to one another and is catalytic in allowing the BCC to develop as a totality in achieving its aims and goals.

Working with a governmental bureaucratic structure, whether it be on a local, state, or federal level, is often bewildering and confusing to those outside the structure. For an inner city community attempting to relate to a governmental bureaucracy, bewilderment often leads to terror and finally to anger or violence. Inner city residents, many from minority groups, after centuries of prejudice, discrimination, persecution, hopelessness, and powerlessness, have little knowledge of the bureaucratic structure and are therefore ill equipped to cope with it.

The Advocacy Planning Unit must, therefore, advise the community of the pathways through the maze created by government. This is its third function. The planners must know or be able to find out to which level of government to direct requests. Direction, however, is only half the answer; the planners are expected to know governmental language, as well as governmental laws and regulations. The planners are responsible for translating the myriad government documents into a language and an order that are comprehensible to the BCC and the

Brownsville community. Such translation is essential if the community is to make any headway in solving its problems.

The advocate planners, besides dealing with procedural matters, are responsible for developing programs of their own for the community. The Planning Unit assists the BCC in identifying, determining, and articulating priorities. Because it is cognizant of the Council's procedures it can also propose plans that will enable the BCC to tackle problems that it had not been able to undertake prior to the creation of the Advocacy Planning Unit.

BCC's Perceptions of Advocacy Planning

Before the advent of the Advocacy Planning Unit, the BCC perceived planning as a highly centralized and bureaucratic function.[8] This perception was derived from the lack of contact between the central government and the city's many communities in developing urban plans and programs, a lack that is especially true for low-income minority communities. The BCC felt that a newer, fresher, and broader approach to community planning was critically necessary.

Even though plans formulated and initiated by Brownsville community leaders had been highly effective, these plans lacked consistent technical expertise. The total community action program of the Council was structured so that theoretically long-range planning was going on in a continuous fashion. Job descriptions of key professionals required that they spend a good deal of energy and time in community action programs. However, long-range planning was minimal because of day-to-day operations, scarcity of professionals, a high percentage of nonprofessionals, and budget limitations that ruled out training assistants. The exi ting

policy boards of the Council lacked the professional expertise to allow for even more fruitful planning.

Thus the BCC realized in 1968 that the addition of an advocacy planning group with a higher level of expertise would help to articulate community goals to government agencies and thus to achieve results. Such a planning group could develop future possibilities for the community. If the planning group could make the community aware that it was getting results for them through the regular channels and processes of government, the community perhaps would not take out its frustration in violence and riots. More important, the community might be significantly revitalized.

The BCC application to NIMH declared:

> The Community Planning Department will be concerned with translating the day-to-day dynamics in the areas of Education, Housing, Health, and Manpower into long-range planning for these same problem areas. A knowledge of the grievances, problems, available community resources, resident aspirations, government planned changes, private industry plans, etc., must be accumulated and applied to shape long-range design. For example, in the field of education there are a myriad of problems which usually create total changes or alterations in school plans. A realistic approach to this would be to maintain a group of planners who understand the process, the steps, the maze of government and how to get through it. A planner would be assigned to the Education Committee so as to help them consider problems not anticipated, and to set priorities in decentralization of schools.[9]

The BCC noted that in the area of housing, quality participation in the Model Cities Program was a problem. The planning group would aid in BCC involvement as a deliverative, systematic process, for in the past, participation had been in numbers primarily.

In the area of health, a planner could gather the statistical evidence to demonstrate the paucity of medical services and facilities.

This evidence could be derived from both field survey and community interviews, as well as in the more statistical data collection from journals, census materials, and the like. This, in turn, would be used to inform and mobilize public opinion. Thus, the planning group would call attention to immediate health problems and the possibilities for alleviation of those conditions and suffering.

In the area of manpower, official government at all levels are making commitments to new approaches to the problem of unskilled, untrained, undereducated workers concentrated in ghetto areas. The BCC saw planning in this area not only in terms of creating more individual jobs, but also in planning for community wealth.

The actual placement of the planning unit within the functional structure of BCC initially proved to be something of a problem. However, as the conceptualization of advocacy planning crystalized, the problems became fewer.

Formal Structure of the BCC

Having established the various attitudes of the National Institute of Mental Health, the Brownsville Community Council, and the Advocacy Planning Unit toward advocacy planning and the function of the Advocacy Planning Unit, let us examine the structure of the parent organization and the Unit's place within that structure. The nature of formal and informal ties to the BCC affect the ability of the Unit to get its assignments completed; the structure not only enhances or detracts from the successful completion of assignments, but indicates sources of priorities as well as goals.

The Brownsville Community Council, which was incorporated in June of 1965 in order to receive federal, state, and local monies, is one of twenty-six community development corporations created throughout New York City. These corporations are the backbone of community development in New York City, receiving allocations from the Council Against Poverty, a subdivision of the Human Resources Administration of the City of New York. The Council Against Poverty has fifty-two members: twenty-six representatives from each designated poverty area, seventeen public officials, and nine individuals from the private sector. The Council Against Poverty allocates funds to the BCC to run twenty-seven programs in the broad areas of housing, education, manpower, economic development, and health.

The BCC membership consists of:

A. Eligible membership organizations, incorporated and unincorporated, associations, business organizations and individuals.

B. Representatives of governmental agencies and public bodies working in Brownsville.

C. Individual members, eighteen years and older, who are residents of the Brownsville community and who are designated by the BCC to have full right of discussion at all general meetings of the Council, and to have the right to vote.

Only such independent membership organizations that have no less than ten bona fide members and such business organizations that have less than ten employees are eligible for membership in the Council. Each such organization is represented in the Council by two delegates who are designated in writing. The Council, as a whole, sets standards and procedures for admission to members and may at its sole discretion accept or reject any organization. New members are accepted by a majority vote at a regular meeting.

The general assembly, the central controlling body of BCC, consists of two delegates for each membership organization and those individual members who are accepted under the ruling of the constitution. The general assembly elects the BCC's president.

Guidance of the Council as a community corporation is the function of the Board of Directors, which consists of fifty-five members. Participation and numerical representation on the Board is based on the division of the Brownsville area into five subareas. Each of these subareas elects seven members to the Board of Directors. The thirty-five elected Board members in turn select ten additional individuals from the community to join them as Board members subject to the approval of the general assembly. The general assembly selects ten additional representatives to be on the Board, making the total fifty-five. The Board of Directors is the legal governing body of the corporation but has a moral obligation to follow the dictates of the general assembly. Since Board members are elected from the five subareas and have a chosen constituency, it is reasonable to assume that informal sanctions exist to make the Board of Directors accountable to the general assembly. These informal sanctions might be withdrawal of subarea support or constituency pressure on elected Board members. The general assembly, which meets once a month, makes recommendations to the Board of Directors for policy and possible action by the Council. Board meetings scheduled once a month can be increased if more meetings are needed, as in crisis situations, or if getting a job done cannot wait.

The Board of Directors appoints an Executive Director, who must be confirmed by the general assembly. The Executive Director has the overall responsibility for the functioning of the agency. He maintains

communication with the Council through formal reports to both the general assembly and the Board of Directors. The Executive Director and his staff maintain open channels within the Council and direct their energies to the smooth functioning of the organization.

Reports submitted to the Board of Directors and the general assembly are based in part on the meetings of the Executive Committee. The Executive Committee is composed of the Executive Director, the associate directors of administration (which is subdivided into personnel and finance departments and maintenance and clerical) and programs operations (subdivided into manpower, Head Start, consumer education, Probe, PRCAP, education, YTA, day care, family health, mental health), and the directors and coordinators in charge of the subdivisions. The Executive Committee creates a forum for discussion of problems, programs, and general information which is initially communicated to supervisory staff.

A board of directors is elected in each of the five subareas. They assume the responsibility of directing and controlling community agencies in their subareas. The subarea board has the added functions of screening, interviewing, processing, hiring, and firing of personnel for delegate agencies in their subarea.

The Central Office of the Brownsville Community Council is the center for cross-communication and monitoring. The Personnel Department of the Office of Administration receives a copy of applications of all employees hired. This Department is responsible for such matters as the employees' fringe benefits, income tax forms, W-2 forms, leaves of absence, and other personnel material.

The Finance Department of the Office of Administration is responsible for payrolls, wages, salaries, consulting fees, insurance,

control and auditing of petty cash monies, bank accounts, and monthly financial reports.

The Central Office of the Brownsville Community Council handles all purchases of major supplies and equipment.

Advocacy Planning Unit

The Advocacy Planning Unit is comprised of three full-time persons; full-time and part-time employees and consultants are added from time to time, based upon need. The competencies of the staff, though varied, are mainly in the field of economics. The Director is a Ph.D. candidate in the field of economics and other staff members are in or have been in related fields. The group also has expertise in research planning and statistical analysis.

Structurally, the Unit is directly responsible to the Executive Director of the BCC. Since at the time of its creation there already existed a unit called the Office of Program Planning, Advocacy Planning titles and lines of authority immediately raised potential issues of conflict, as will be discussed later in this report.

Agendas and Meetings

The Advocacy Planning Unit is required to attend board meetings, executive board meetings, and executive staff meetings of the BCC. It may, but is not mandated to, attend meetings of delegate agencies and/or units of the BCC. No evidence is available to substantiate the number of meetings attended by Advocacy Planning. Attendance at board meetings, executive board meetings, and executive staff meetings can be substantiated in the recorded minutes in some cases, but not in all.

Formal Communication

The Advocacy Planning Unit has initiated a number of contacts with the Department of Finance and Department of Personnel regarding employment of various individuals; fringe benefits, fiscal reports, pay raises and telephone services.

Communication with the Board of Directors has been limited to formal progress reports of the Planning Unit, assignment reports such as the Brookdale Hospital report; or copies of memos or letters which Advocacy Planning usually sent to the President and Chairman of the Board of the BCC.

Informal Communication

The Advocacy Planning Unit maintained an essentially behind-the-scenes role in the Brownsville community. Little effort has been made to relate the Advocacy Planning Unit's accomplishments to the community. Outside of the Board of Directors, with whom the Advocacy Planning Unit works directly, and the BCC executive staff, not much is known in Brownsville about the Advocacy Planning Unit.

In written reports submitted to the Board indicating what projects have been initiated and what progress has been made, it is not unusual for the Executive Director to include statements related to the Advocacy Planning Unit and its work. This procedure is sometimes utilized as a substitute for a written monthly progress report.

Conflicts

Except for executive staff meetings or person-to-person contact, there is little information showing cooperation on joint projects between BCC organizational units and the Advocacy Planning Unit. This, however,

is allegedly by design. Advocacy Planning, as a policy matter, decided that it could get more cooperation as a new unit if it subordinated itself to older, equal, or more influential units. This decision was made after the Unit's initial cool reception by at least one other ongoing unit. Many Advocacy Planning efforts were in direct person-to-person or telephone contacts and are, therefore, not always recorded in memos.

In some cases the Advocacy Planning Unit sent memos and copies of letters to unit heads in charge of administration and of program planning. This was the only direct form of communication informing other BCC units of Advocacy Planning activities.

CHAPTER III

DEMOGRAPHY OF BROWNSVILLE

Brownsville is a subsection of the borough of Brooklyn, which, in turn, is part of a larger bureaucratic system, New York City. This bureaucracy is part of an even larger one, New York State, which, in turn, is subsumed within the federal government. The "A," "B," "C," series seems childish, but when one realizes that Brownsville is in very real ways controlled and financially fed by all of these bureaucratic subsystems and systems, one begins to have a feel for the entanglement of bureaucratic structures that Brownsville officials must work their way through for financial, political, and other forms of sustenance. Such organizational problems are routine for most political systems and normally would not require noting. Brownsville, however, is a community whose citizens for sociopolitical and socioeconomic reasons rooted in racism have been kept out of the mainstream of American life. Its people are at a decided disadvantage in relating to and being attended to by the bureaucratic superstructure which determines Brownsville's very existence.

Brownsville's citizens are mainly black and Puerto Rican. A walking tour of the community reveals a terrain with much the same appearance as Watts, Detroit, or Wilmington, Delaware, after the riots. What catches the eye immediately are the fire-scarred skeletons of buildings put to the torch by persons who, filled with despair, frustration, and hostility, are convinced that there is no other means of giving vent to their plight. Rubbish-strewn lots of broken glass are the playgrounds of Brownsville youths. Block after block of streets littered by broken

bottles, garbage, and rusting bodies of automobiles acquaint the observer with some of the artifacts of twentieth-century technology in a poor community.

The Brownsville community is one of the most densely populated sections of both Brooklyn and New York City. It consists mostly of multiple dwellings: three-story frame buildings, four-story tenements units, and dense low-income public housing complexes. At least three quarters of the dwellings are in various stages of deterioration and much of the housing is in a state of advanced decay. Housing tends to be best where there is owner occupancy. In this community absentee ownership often means building abandonment and/or deterioration of services and upkeep of property.

Merchants, businessmen, and professionals are noticeably absent as residents. Because of their sociopolitical status and economic power these three groups create an atmosphere of economic, social, and political stability for a community. Civic and secular leaders are responsive to their needs, values, and aspirations. Unlike with the poor, their existence means more social, political, economic, educational, and cultural options for themselves and others in the community. The community's efforts to develop a stable foundation become increasingly frustrated when such a power group is by and large missing from the community. The absence of such a group is felt not only in economic terms but as human resources for bringing about change and leadership. This absence is keenly felt by Brownsville.

Census figures indicate that Brownsville is steadily losing its residents. In 1940, Brownsville had 170,000 residents; in 1950, 142,000 residents; in 1960, 118,000 residents; and in 1970, the population was estimated at 100,000 residents.

Ethnically, the proportion of blacks in the overall population has increased from a little more than 50 percent in 1960 to more than 75 percent in this decade. The black and Spanish populations are increasing proportionately. Caucasians comprise less than 15 percent of the present population and their numbers are steadily dwindling as they continue their flight to the suburbs.

New York City has twenty-six poverty target areas. Brownsville has been singled out as the second worse of all twenty-six. Four out of every five families that reside in this community receive some form of public assistance. The 1960 census indicates that of the 38,158 families living in Brownsville at that time, almost half (19,079 families) were surviving on annual incomes of $4,000 or less. The welfare assistance rate alone is 303.4 persons per 1,000 or approximately 39,838 people out of 118,000. In 1965, more than 50 percent of the 53,877 children under the age of eighteen residing in the community were receiving aid from the New York City Department of Welfare. This constitutes a ratio of 510 persons per 1,000. Social security and aid to the aged are the other major forms of public assistance being received.

There are sixteen elementary schools, three junior high schools, and no high schools in the Brownsville area. Of the sixteen elementary schools, six are fifty years old or older. Three others are between forty-five and fifty years old. A random survey revealed that some of these schools lack such basic facilities as a cafeteria or gymnasium. Education has been one of the focal rallying points for members of the Brownsville community. During the latter part of the 1960's Ocean Hill-Brownsville received front-page headlines as a result of community efforts

to secure a viable educational system in which it was also the decision-making agent.

Further evidence of school needs is the extreme shortage of seating facilities in Brownsville schools. The Allen Report suggested the building of educational complexes, but little headway has been made in the area of school construction. Curriculum is deficient; it is often unrelated to the needs and aspirations of the students. High rates of truancy, school dropouts, and apathy toward school are the major outputs of the system. In 1965, for example, over one third of young adults of high school age were not attending school. Inferior education leaves these young people ill equipped to break the chains of poverty and deprivation.

The Brownsville area also suffers from a lack of strategically located cultural and recreational facilities. In part, these deficiencies, and the additional pressures placed upon the young who feel trapped, account for the high rate of petty difficulties with the police, setting off of false alarms, and even worse acts of vandalism and crime. The failure of social institutions to assist Brownsville residents in acquiring skills necessary to increase their life space options is exemplified by the unemployment rate, which is proportionately twice as great as that of the rest of New York City. Furthermore, with the median annual income for Brownsville residents $4,000-$5,000, unemployment figures do not even touch on the rate of underemployment, or menial, low-paying jobs. The life expectancy for residents of this community is several years less than that of other New York City residents; the infant mortality rate is four times

as great as that of the rest of the city. One out of every four children suffers from some type of dietary deficiency. The incidence of venereal disease is three times as great as the whole of New York City. And there are a total of four doctors in all of Brownsville.

Alienation, despair, unemployment, underemployment, inadequate education, ill health, substandard housing, and high crime rates best describe the Brownsville area. Twelve years after the launching of the War on Poverty these conditions still exist.

This is the setting in which the Advocacy Planning Unit found itself and in which it now exists.

CHAPTER IV

ADVOCACY PLANNING UNIT ACTIVITIES

In order to enhance the decision-making process, as well as to find suitable space for its activities, the Unit developed a number of planning tools for the community. (As will be seen later in this chapter, finding suitable buildings or sites in Brownsville is a problem.)

Theoretical Designs and Matrices

The Site Selection Matrix defines several structural, financial, spatial, and locational characteristics. Depending on their relative importance to a prospective tenant, the characteristics are numerically weighted on a scale from one to ten.

> Value points ranging from minus two to plus two are assigned to each category depending on a set of objective and subjective characteristics. Basically, these characteristics are used to judge the divergence of the factor from an "ideal" norm. When a prospective site has been investigated, it is rated according to the algebraic sum of the weight times the quality points. This cumulative total function can be easily maximized or minimized.[1]

When Advocacy Planning was searching for office space certain practices in lease signing and renovation confronted the planners. In a ghetto community such as Brownsville landlords are very reluctant to enter into lease negotiations with community groups. The landlords want long-term leases and fear that a community action group will have a tendency to fold up even before a year has passed. This fear is reflected in exorbitant rents charged to projects funded by the government. The Advocacy Planning Unit, recognizing this situation, decided that getting outside expertise was essential not only for their particular needs, but

also for other BCC projects and programs. When leases are up or new ones are to be negotiated, the Planning Unit decided along with BCC that a real estate consultant should be called in to assist in contacting and negotiating with the manager or owner of the desired site. As a consequence of the Planning Unit's experience in searching for office space, the BCC's Board of Directors has assigned to Advocacy Planning the responsibility of reviewing existing leases and advising the Council in their negotiations for future leases.

Frequently, when a site is selected, moderate-to-extensive renovations have to be considered, since most of Brownsville's possible office space is in shabby condition. In the past, the BCC had hired a general contractor who in turn would subcontract for the appropriate renovation. The high cost and the relatively poor quality of the work led the planners to think of possible alternate methods. After discussions with various individuals and groups in the BCC, the planners came up with the idea of having the Planning Unit itself act as the general contractor. Architectural drawings were handled by the architect retained by the BCC. The planners accepted bids and awarded contracts on the basis of bids and references. The results of all these steps meant a reduction in cost of up to 40 percent and in renovations of a relatively superior quality.[2]

The Project Evaluation Matrix grew out of the desire and the need to find out what the community wanted or did not want in possible projects emanating from the BCC. This matrix is an outgrowth of the conceptualization of Advocacy Planning and is similar to the Site Selection Matrix.

> Several desirable features of a project are defined and weighted according to the need for that feature as expressed by the community through polls, surveys, etc. ... Although

> the format is not one of complete quaiification, it is easy to see that the variables could be expressed in symbolic form and quantified.[3]

Advocacy Planning is interested not only in tapping community points of view on proposed projects, but also in ensuring that BCC projects progress at a normal rate. Project evaluation is, therefore, crucial to a community's hopes for the future. All too often in the past, promises have not been fulfilled. In cooperation with the BCC staff the planners developed the Program Evaluation and Review Technique (PERT) to avoid future frustration. A project is seen as having many component activities, and some of these activities can be taken only in sequential order. The PERT method assigns beginning and end points to a project. This format organizes planning into three phases: activity, analyses, arrow diagramming and mode numbering.

> Planners determine the list of activities required, methods to be used, tools and equipment and the technological precedence of the activities. Each activity is then given a time duration and is represented by an arrow. The longest time from the first to the last event is known as the critical path. Part of the planner's job then is to find ways of shortening the critical path.[4]

Clearly, the practices and tools described above are needed to arm the Advocacy Planning Unit with ammunition to mount an attack on the myriad problems facing Brownsville. Their attack has been on many fronts.

Human Resource Bank

As soon as the Planning Unit was in operation, its staff began attending community meetings and activities.[5] By doing so, the planners were able to familiarize themselves with the community, its concerns, its goals, and its problems, and attempt to become visible to the community.

Apparently as an outgrowth of attending these meetings, the planners set up a Special Projects Committee which was to plan for the BCC's involvement in special activities.[6] Not only did the planners involve themselves in community affairs but they inaugurated a lecture series to bring scholars and experts to Brownsville from all over the city to talk about community concerns.[7]

The Brownsville community has its own reservoir of skills and resources, though not as much as it needs to overcome its problems. The community and the BCC felt the need to build up that reservoir. The planners helped in this endeavor by seeking out various organizations, such as NAACP, Urban League, and BLAC of Brooklyn College, and bringing them to the community.[8]

Education

The Advocacy Planning Unit had been in operation for only a very short time when in June 1969 the New York City Decentralization Plan was proposed. This plan was designed to guide the community in directing the educational process for its children. At that time, questions came up on the future of the Ocean Hill-Brownsville experimental school district and who would eventually control the schools. The BCC called an educational conference. Some of the topics at the conference were (1) a plan for a school complex (educational park), (2) intensive training for local residents to serve on local school boards, (3) accountability of teachers and administrators for the effectiveness of education in general, (4) continuation of the experimental district. The planners participated in this conference so as to familiarize themselves with the complex questions and answers for education in a ghetto community.[9]

Health

Education was not the only issue that planners concerned themselves with during this period of April to June, 1969. Brownsville was faced with a tremendous shortage of adequate health care. The only hospital serving Brownsville (as well as part of the neighboring community of East New York) is the Brookdale Hospital. The residents of Brownsville felt that Brookdale was not meeting the community's needs for health care on any level. Comunity residents, through BCC, complained to hospital officials about the quantity and quality of treatment at the hospital. The hospital Board of Trustees sympathized with Brownsville, but nothing was changed so far as community residents were concerned.

To bring about the perceived needed change, the BCC undertook a health campaign. Its main goal was to seek representation on the Board of Trustees of Brookdale Hospital so as to assist in providing better services for the community. To help determine the types and quality of services to be rendered, the Advocacy Planning staff investigated the available types of services, facilities, programs as well as the number of Brownsville residents using these services.[10]

The Brookdale Health Coalition, representing community groups and hospital administrators, sought to find a solution to the problems. Between January and June of 1970 they failed to come to grips with the demands previously stated. Brookdale Hospital did not deny the validity of the community's accusations, but pointed to insufficient funds and, therefore, insufficient professional and other staff services as the cause. The planners reviewed the funding sources of the Brookdale Hospital, including federal funding for various programs and services.[11]

As an outgrowth of the Health Coalition's failure, the HCC alerted the local community about Brookdale's bad faith in bargaining.[12] A series of community rallies and demonstrations was coordinated by the HCC on the sites of the hospital and businesses owned by Board of Trustee members.[13] The planners'role consisted of preparing posters and supplying arguments and supportive data to the HCC.[14]

Community Development Agency

From June to October, 1970, while the Brookdale issue was continuing, a mandate from the Community Development Agency (CDA) was discussed. The CDA was one of the sources of potential funds for the HCC. This particular mandate stated that a community should give a high priority to economic development. The Advocacy Planning staff perceived the need for a general staff orientation to the CDA mandate. To meet this need, the planners set up a series of conferences to discuss: (1) the significance of economic development for the community and HCC; (2) various projects that might be undertaken by HCC; and (3) views as to how HCC might function under this new priority order.[15]

At the same time that these conferences were being organized, the CDA made a 3 and 3/4 percent budget cut, which in effect eliminated many of HCC's programs directly related to the mandate and to community needs. The HCC's reaction to the budget cut was to protest and to organize its own strike against CDA's action. During this period the planners were asked to write a position paper to strengthen the HCC's argument against the cuts and for restoration of the deleted funds. The planners went one step further and developed alternative criteria for the allocation of area-wide CDA funds.[16]

Cultural Programs

While CAA funds were being cut, the Office of Economic Opportunity (OEO) changed its funding priorities so that cultural programs could not be financed by that office. (The OEO is indirectly attached to the BCC.) The BCC and the Advocacy Planning Unit were faced with preparing an alternate approach to a very crucial part of a ghetto community's life. The BCC and its advocate planners realized that a community needs a form of self-identification and self-awareness, of which cultural programs are a vital ingredient. Such programs expose the community members to ideas and perhaps even possible solutions. Above all, they help to form a cohesive community.

In order to continue the cultural programs, the BCC initiated the Brownsville Cultural Arts Project. The solution to the lack of funding was to make the program self-supporting. This was done by incorporating a cultural workshop with a profit-making component. The project was conceived to comprise three sections: (1) Graphic Arts Workshop: the workshop would compose advertising material for cultural programs. However, for the most part, advertising material would be destined for business firms and social agencies within Brownsville as well as beyond; (2) Sewing Component: this group would supply garments to the community; and (3) Actual Cultural Programs: the first two components would rely heavily on volunteers so as to produce profits to support the third component.[17]

Economic Conditions

As seen from much of the above, the Unit's analyses were not confined to matrices alone. It decided that a detailed analysis of the

community's economic condition would enable the BCC to strengthen existing programs and help define, formulate, and perceive goals for future community needs. With this in mind the advocate planners proposed an Economic Base Study for Brownsville.

> Such a study would pinpoint areas of strength and weakness in the community economy and help the community to (a) solve local problems; (b) make intelligent policy-decisions on a broad range of local issues; (c) apply pressure on city or other governmental bodies to modify or institute certain policies favorable to the community; and (4) evaluate its progress toward certain broad goals such as increasing per capita income and employment, improving the delivery of community services and skills to its residents.[18]

The same study could be used in forecasting; an understanding of economic forces that had shaped the community in the past would be helpful in projecting the economic future of Brownsville.

For those BCC members who lack the skills to read budget reports, the planners "developed a simplified set of formulas for understanding the monthly financial reports."[19] The whole idea was to help program directors and delegate agencies understand budget relationships.

In the same vein, the planners undertook a cost-benefit analysis so that program directors and delegate agencies could set their goals in a realistic fashion. Cost-benefit analysis would be beneficial to individuals and groups in that it would enable them to maximize use of their allocated funds. The planners saw it as "an additional technique that Advocacy Planning could use in appraising certain prospective projects for federal or other funding."[20]

The staff of Advocacy Planning, convinced that cost-benefit analysis for the consumer would be beneficial, proposed a consumer price

index for Brownsville. The index would monitor the fluctuation of general price levels in the community and relate it to price movements in New York City and the nation. The index would also provide quantitative measures of price discrimination between black and white neighborhoods; it would be used to check on sudden and abnormal price increases of specific items or groups of items. This device would facilitate the identification of low-price establishments to be recommended to the community. Finally, the index could be used to make funding agencies aware of economic conditions in Brownsville.

A ghetto community such as Brownsville suffers from the fact that the "poor pay more." Various consumer products such as food, clothing, and furniture, are in far too many instances overpriced for the quality received. Store owners have a virtual monopoly over prices in the neighborhood. There are many reasons for this: Community residents may lack education in comparative shopping. Even if they are knowledgeable about comparative shopping, they may not have the time to shop in other stores in and around the neighborhood. They may also lack the means or the money for transportation to other parts of the city to take advantage of bargains.

To help community residents save money and receive the highest quality for the prices they pay, buying clubs were set up in Brownsville. These clubs bought foodstuffs in quantity from the wholesalers and then filled orders for residents. Advocacy Planning proposed a Centralized Buying Club. This idea

> was designed to enhance the efficiency of buying clubs then operating in the five administrative areas into which Brownsville is divided. The Central Buying Office would

> purchase for all individual clubs, thus lowering costs. In addition, excess revenue generated would be used by the Central Buying Office for enlarging the operation. It was designed to purchase merchandise for small retail establishments.[21]

There are still other economic hardships faced by the Brownsville community. A resident of a ghetto has difficulty in saving money, and high hospital, dental, or health-care bills, may confront him suddenly. The head of a household may need to buy a car if he is to continue his employment with a firm that has moved its location to the suburbs or to New Jersey. Or he may need to make home repairs. In all of these instances the individual may have to borrow money. For the inner city dweller this is often difficult, if not impossible, to borrow money from a bank. The BCC, aware of this problem, sponsored the Brownsville Federal Credit Union. The Union, however, was small and could not adequately meet the financial demands made upon it. Advocacy Planning made recommendations to the Credit Union on ways to assist its growth; and it also prepared and submitted to Model Cities and elsewhere a proposal seeking supplemental funds to increase the Union's lending power.[22] Its growth will make it easier for residents to pay for automobiles, cooperative apartments, and home repairs.

One of the major problems in Brownsville is refuse collection. Inadequate and nonfunctioning incinerators for overcrowded apartments only aggravate the garbage removal problem. The BCC and the Advocacy Planning Unit believed that Brownsville was being neglected by municipal government. The Advocacy Planning Unit developed a proposal for a Brownsville Carting Company that would pursue contracts to dispose of waste materials from institutions and commercial enterprises. An attempt

would be made to have some of the refuse recycled into useful by-products. The project has the potential for job development, local ownership, and the spawning of new businesses.[23] But as yet the proposal has not become a reality.

One of the new businesses that did proceed past the proposal stage was a food service facility (a type of restaurant) established and operated by the Daughters of African Descent (DAD) in Brownsville. Advocacy Planning was called on to evaluate the program so as to promote a continuation of funding past the fiscal year 1969-1970. They reported back after several meetings with BCC and DAD on how to maximize efficiency.[24]

Preschool Program

Children who enter school have various motor, verbal, and conceptual skills. The middle and upper classes have more time, money, and tradition to develop these skills. This is not the case in Brownsville. For this reason BCC has participated in the Head Start Program for preschool children. To improve Head Start in Brownsville, "Advocacy Planning has contributed to the preparation of documents for submission to Central Brooklyn Model Cities in an effort to get funds for expansion and renovation of three Head Start Centers operated by the Brownsville Community Council."[25]

Cooperation with Other Agencies

Advocacy Planning is submitting proposals for funding to Model Cities, based on its close contact with Model Cities and on information developed by Model Cities for Brownsville.[26] Working cooperatively with Model Cities, the Advocacy Planning Unit suggested the following:

> In cataloguing needs, the first line of attach might be to make three surveys:

(1) Existing Land Use Survey to determine the relationship between residential, commercial, and industrial land use;

(2) Existing Zoning Survey to determine if land is currently being used according to existing zoning or if rezoning is required; and

(3) Building Condition Survey to determine the current conditions of buildings and classify them either for demolition, rehabilitation or no action.[27]

The analysis of housing deterioration is only one of several analyses performed by the Advocacy Planning Unit. As was stated earlier, CDA mandated economic viability as crucial. For this reason, the planners undertook an analysis of a company in Brownsville. This company was offering 50 percent of its stock to its employees, 90 percent of whom lived in Brownsville, in order to be able to expand to meet outside competition. After the analysis of the data, "it was established by Advocacy Planning and in collaboration with experts from government agencies dealing in small businesses, that the company was in serious financial condition."[28] The workers were advised that it was not in their best interests to invest.

Another analysis by Advocacy Planning paved the way for a proposal designed to attract funds for a health careers training program; negotiations with the Labor Department are underway toward that end.[29]

The conceptualization of Advocacy Planning by the BCC, and the Advocacy Planning's proposals and projects provide graphic evidence of a community seeking to delineate its own desires and goals. It is clear from the Unit's activities reported above that the planners realized that when central planning bodies' decisions were handed down, counter plans had to be made available. The planners were initiators of plans as well.

Usually an inner city community would react negatively to imposed plans. But as conceptualized by the BCC, Advocacy Planning introduced plans to ameliorate existing conditions and to forestall potential problems, plans that were likely to be received positively by the community.

Perceptions of the BCC and ABL by City Employees in Brownsville

How did city workers in the community (firemen and policemen) view the BCC and the Advocacy Planning Unit? In order to answer this question, evaluators created an instrument to measure change.

To determine whether or not others saw any difference in Brownsville and its citizens' behavior after the arrival of the Advocacy Planning Unit, the Center for Urban Education submitted a questionnaire to the policemen and firemen in the Brownsville community. The local officers of these departments indicated that approval for such questionnaires would have to come from their respective commissioners' offices. (Copies of the questionnaires submitted to both commissioners are attached in Appendix B of this report.)

We were well aware of this, but wanted to see if we would get any cooperation at all from the local precincts. The police precinct did not respond to our letter and questionnaire until our fifth call, and then indicated that they had more important things to do in their "hell hole." On the other hand, the fire department personnel were cooperative and assisted us in making direct contact with the fire commissioner's office. The police commissioner's office did not respond for three weeks and then summarily refused to participate. The fire commissioner's office responded in about the same time, but indicated that it would reproduce the

questionnaire at its own expense because of the delay, and would see that the local firemen were given the time to fill it out. They made it clear that they would not compel anyone to respond but would monitor the distribution of the questionnaire. Local community relations officers sent the completed questionnaires by messenger to our offices in New York City.

(It must be remembered that at the time of our request to both the fire and police departments, the police department was feeling the pressures involved with the Knapp Commission public hearings.)

The intent of the questionnaire was to determine the attitudes of the fire and police workers in the Brownsville community toward the community, the BCC, and the Advocacy Planning Unit. If the BCC had effected changes in line with community needs and desires, a corresponding change would presumably have occurred in community attitudes toward and treatment of the fire and police workers.

Early in the study, an oral interview was conducted with policemen and firemen. The interview was constructed so as to give every semblance of just being a "rap" session between a non-Brownsville white who happened to come along and a policeman or fireman. Six firemen and four policemen were interviewed. In every instance, the comments were negative about Brownsville and the BCC, and no one had heard of the Advocacy Planning Unit. Many, if not most, of the responses had racial overtones. "What do you expect from people like this?" "They're animals." "They don't care that we are trying to help them."

TABLE I

Selected Characteristics of Firemen in Brownsville Community*

Age	20-35	36-45	46 or older
	0	77% (7)	22% (2)

Educational Level Attained	High School	Some College	Completed College
	71% (5)	25% (2)	0

Residency	N.Y.C.	Long Island	N.Y. State
	20% (2)	70% (7)	10% (1)

No. of Years on Force	0 -10	11-20	21-30
	0	70% (7)	30% (3)

No. of Years in Brownsville	0 - 5	6-10	11 or more
	10% (1)	40% (4)	50% (5)

* 11 firemen responded, but all did not answer all of the above and other questions.

The formal questionnaire (see Appendix B) was responded to by eleven firemen. The table indicates that the majority of respondents are above thirty-six years of age (approximately forty), do not live in Brownsville, have completed a high school education, and have been firemen for at least eleven years with a minimum of eight years' service to Brownsville. All of the firemen indicated that there were as many, or maybe more, fire alarms within the last two years than before then.

Of the eleven respondents, 73 percent reported hearing of the BCC, while 100 percent did not know of Advocacy Planning. Of the former group, 37 percent felt that the organization was of no help to the community, 26 percent were uncertain of the effect of the BCC in the community, but tended to feel it had a positive effect, 37 percent felt that the organization was effective. When asked about changes in the community in the last two years, 36 percent reported improvements, 28 percent stated that conditions were worse, and 36 percent felt that there was no change in the community.

The same 36 percent who reported positive change in the community also reported more receptiveness to their role by the community. They felt the upswing was due to the reduction of the number of militants, such as the Black Panthers, a positive change brought about by the BCC. Those firemen who reported no change, or worsening of conditions, felt a hostility or lack of understanding on the part of the community of the functions of the fire department.

Two responses to our question "Do you think that having the BCC has helped the community? How?", were:

> Yes, but in my opinion, it is not used to help the majority of the residents of the Brownsville community. To say the least about it is that it gives some of the people a feeling that someone cares.

> they are supposed to improve the living conditions of the citizens in Brownsville they have failed with a big percentage .... The fire department still is called to help the citizens when pipes are broken or there is no heat or someone needs assistance. We do what we can.... We have as much trouble getting the owner of the building as they do.

An analysis of these responses indicates that the respondents recognize the intent of the BCC even if they do not see all the change

or help desired. The second respondent who wrote of "broken pipes" ends by noting the general desire to help on the part of both BCC and the fire department and the resistance they both meet from absentee owners. It is significant that, as reflected in the first respondent's statement, the feeling that someone cares is being conveyed. This feeling may explain the community members' change of behavior toward firemen. It will be recalled that in Chapter II the statement was made that change in the perception of powerlessness on the part of community residents would result in behavioral changes toward themselves and those about them. From at least the perception of that part of the establishment, the fire department, there has been a change in attitude and behavior. The sample size may appear small, but the total firemen staff was only fifteen at the time of the study and the four who did not fill out the questionnaire were not on duty or were ill. It is also true that at best only 62 percent of the men either were doubtful about a change or saw a change. This, however, is not only a majority of those interviewed, but a 100 percent increase over the first interview conducted.

These figures and statements take on greater significance in light of the evidence from Table 1. Responses were given by middle-aged, lower-middle-class white suburbanites with, by and large, only high school education. Additionally, respondents were individuals who risk their lives in saving the community that takes them for the "enemy." In such a situation, one would expect race hatred, bigotry, blunders, and indifference; such, however, has not been the case. If such groups felt or saw change, then it is likely that change had occurred.

It should be pointed out that no one in either interview had heard of the Advocacy Planning Unit but all had heard of the Brownsville Community Council.

Attitudes of Community Citizens

Talks with Puerto Rican citizens and Puerto Rican agency personnel revealed that the Council has not convinced this segment of the community of its intentions to work equally hard for all citizens. The Puerto Ricans admit that the Council is getting more and more money into the community and helping "to some degree" to improve conditions, but they are concerned that Puerto Ricans are not benefiting to the same degree that blacks are. Almost every Puerto Rican or black community person who had heard of the Advocacy Planning Unit indicated that the Unit may be helping them indirectly and the BCC directly, but that the Unit does not relate well to the "man on the street." "He makes us feel that he is the professional and we don't know nothing," was a typical comment.

There may be many reasons for the Council's visibility; a major reason is surely the fact that its name appears on centers, program sites, and subdivisions throughout Brownsville more than that of any other agency. Furthermore, as the description of its formal structure indicated, elections to the BCC are community-wide and represent all ethnic groups.

Report of Advocacy Planning's Effectiveness

The Advocacy Planning Unit of the Brownsville Community Council accomplished much for both the BCC and the community, but not as much as it might have, for the following reasons: underfinancing, understaffing, a lack of professional expertise on the part of its full-time staff; unfortunate problems with regard to its placement in the going formal

structure of the Brownsville Community Council, personality differences, and a tendency toward isolationism on the part of its leadership.

As discussed earlier, the Unit developed theoretical designs and matrices. Its financial accounting and reporting design was adopted by the Financial Department of the BCC and is still being utilized. The Site Selection Matrix has not been employed since the time the Unit itself utilized it. The main difficulty with that method is that the Unit staff is too small to keep housing and building occupancy and fitness information up to date; the Matrix may also be too complicated for nonprofessionals to use without the Advocacy Planning Unit's assistance.

The Unit's efforts to locate community and out-of-community expertise are still bearing fruition. Consultants found by the Advocacy Planning Unit and currently being used have improved the quality of the work of both the BCC and the Unit. The Unit's efforts also coalesced previously disparate forces who are now relating in significant ways to each other, attempting to improve conditions in Brownsville.

The Unit failed to "move" Brookdale Hospital, but it did develop a data bank of health needs and it did arouse the community's concern for doing something about those needs. The community's actions, in fact, utilized legal rather than non- or extra-legal means to achieve its ends. The Unit helped to keep cultural activities of the community alive. The Cultural Art Project is still in existence owing in some measure to the Advocacy Planning Unit's recommendations.

The Unit's Economic Base Study resulted in a number of proposals and greater insight into community economic problems and possible solutions. The Credit Union has been expanded and is aiding more community residents

because of the Advocacy Planning Unit's consultations and recommendations. The food service facility of the Daughters of African Descent did not immediately go bankrupt, but was able to continue in existence for a period longer than expected.

Summing up, the Advocacy Planning Unit's activities involved the community in self-help situations, coalesced disparate elements, helped to develop a sense of community on the part of many who previously saw no commonality in their problems and the problems of others about them. Also evident is how often the community used legally acceptable tactics to bring about required change. What other variables were at work in bringing about these effects cannot be validated. (The significance of such variables for evaluating this project is noted in the interim report and in the preface to this final report.) Finally, the Unit did help the BCC achieve many of its aims and goals for the community.

All evidence would seem to support the hypothesis that where a low socioeconomic community perceives that some of its demands are being attended to, its sense of powerlessness is reduced, with the result that it relates more positively to authority figures and becomes less alienated, more cohesive, and less destructive. The evidence would also appear to indicate that to some significant degree the advent of and the utilization of an advocacy planning unit helped the Brownsville Community Council to achieve some of its goals, thereby resulting in improvement in the life styles of Brownsville community residents.

Unfortunately, there is another side to the coin, and that side is less positive. Placing the Advocacy Planning Unit on a direct line with the Office of Planning and having the Unit report only to the

Executive Director could only lead to conflict, and it did. If the Office of Planning's director had been informed of the need, value, and specific functions of such a unit and also of how it was to act as a service unit, some of the difficulties that ensued might have been avoided. Freed of such problems the Unit would have been able to publicize its efforts more and to spend more time pursuing its aims and goals. If the Office of Planning and the Advocacy Planning Unit had been housed together, or the Unit with any other part of the organization rather than being in a separate building by itself, the isolationist tendencies might have been lessened. Although the units were together for a while, it is maintained that other factors prevented the desired cohesion. If the Executive Director had had formal as well as informal meetings with the two Unit directors, real or imagined problems could have been reduced.

It is a fact that some of the data collected by the Advocacy Planning Unit already existed in the Office of Planning files; such duplication is a waste. If the BEC had formally required that the Office of Planning and the Advocacy Planning Unit share copies of their monthly reports, the lack of communication between the two would have been eliminated. If the formal structure of the organization had made it mandatory that the Unit work as a theoretical and research design service unit or as consultant to the Office of Planning, then many more joint activities would have been possible and personnel could have been shared. The sharing of personnel would greatly have relieved the understaffed and overworked conditions under which the Advocacy Planning Unit labored.

Another alternative would have permitted the Advocacy Planning Unit to be a part of the executive directorate. If it had not been an adjunct but within the directorate with clear lines of demarcation

regarding its functions and those of other divisions, some of the existing problems would have been avoided. The key here is having all sections, departments, or divisions made aware of the Advocacy Planning Unit's function and its position in the directorate. Still another alternative would have been to place it as the advocate planning arm of the Executive Council with equally clear guidelines as to function and responsibility. It would then be utilized by both the directorate, the implementation arm of the Council, to meet its policy needs, and by the Council whenever it had assignments it desired the Advocacy Planning Unit to carry out.

CONCLUSIONS OF REPLICABLE IMPORTANCE

A number of significant lessons of wide-ranging importance have been learned from evaluating this project. Based as it was on a socionistorical model, and taking into account its positive effect on the community, this project called for a realistic evaluation design, in which the evaluator has responsibility for submitting reports to the NIMH as well as to the officers of the funded project, and is held to contracted deadlines with appropriate grace periods. Such procedures give the Institute sufficient information to monitor and assist projects before their difficulties become too grave; they also aid it in making early decisions about refunding projects.

It is now clear that an advocacy planning unit need not be designed along the lines of the Alinsky model. The unit may be composed of highly trained professionals who advise an ongoing legitimate community organization that has credibility with both the establishment and the community. Such a unit is not likely to work well with a highly volatile, change-oriented organization. The object of such a unit is to articulate

the programs and positions of the community rather than employ confrontation first. By this is meant that an advocacy planning unit does long-range planning for the community on an ongoing basis rather than dealing with crisis situations.

When the ongoing community organization has a planning unit, there should be careful pre-planning and delineation of responsibilities and strong supportive structures so as to facilitate a working relationship between the old and the new units.

Requirements for an advocacy planning unit should include the following, at the least: (1) ability to write programs and proposals; (2) ability to work and train community personnel effectively; (3) expertise in housing and its problems in slum areas; (4) expertise in economics and financing; and (5) expertise in the social sciences with special emphasis upon research design and analysis. To meet these requirements, in most instances, an advocacy planning unit would consist of at least four professionals.

Evidence also indicates that the unit needs to have established its own credibility within the community, if it is to be utilized or believed at all, or it needs to be aligned with an agency that does have such credentials. Attachment to a wide-range, action-oriented agency rather than a specific task-oriented agency would also appear to have the greatest chance of producing successes for the community, unit, and agency.

Based upon this study, it is suggested that grants which are for more than one year be of decreasing yearly amounts. In this way, the agency receiving the grant knows that it must within a given time period find other means of supporting the program than the initial grantor. This method,

it is hoped, will force the grantee to evaluate his programs more fully and objectively, especially if the program is to be paid for out of his own budget or by funds for which other of his programs or proposals are in competition.

Whenever a unit is created and is to be made a part of an ongoing institution then: (1) the relationship between that new unit and the parent organization should be spelled out in advance to all parties; (2) lines of authority should be sharply delineated and initially adhered to scrupulously. It is easier to relax a procedure after all parties are clear as to its purpose than to "tighten up" procedures. The reason for this is that it is harder to break an informal, normative behavioral pattern and establish a highly formal one over any short period of time. People generally resent changes that are going to make greater demands upon them than changes that may reduce those demands.

What is of most replicable importance is the fact that an advocacy planning unit can be employed to help develop a sense of community where one does not exist and channel community involvement and concern into nonviolent but constructive avenues for change. These benefits flowing from advocacy planning relate positively to the mental health of the inner city community by enhancing its ability to cope with a hostile environment.

CHAPTER I

1. Paul Davidoff, "Advocacy and Pluralism in Planning," Journal of The American Institute of Planners, Vol. 31 (November 1965), p. 332.

2. Lisa R. Peattie, "Reflections on Advocacy Planning," Journal of The American Institute of Planners, Vol. 34 (March 1968), p. 80.

3. Paul Davidoff, op. cit.

4. Lisa R. Peattie, op. cit., p. 81.

5. Paul Davidoff, op. cit.

6. Dr. Frances Piven, "Advocacy as a Strategy of Political Management," Perspectra (Yale Architectural Magazine), Vol. 1237 (1969), p. 37.

7. Ibid., p. 37.

8. Ibid., p. 38.

9. Clarence Funnye, "Whom Does the Advocate Planner Serve? The Advocate Planner as an Urban Hustler," Social Policy, July-August 1970, p. 36.

10. C. Richard Hatch. "Some Thoughts on Advocacy Planning," Architectural Forum, Vol. 128 (June 1968), p. 72.

11. Chester W. Hartman, "Whom Does the Advocate Planner Serve? From Hired Gun to Political Partisan," Social Policy, July-August 1970, p. 37.

12. Lisa R. Peattie, op. cit., p. 82.

13. Marshall Kaplan, "Advocacy and the Urban Poor," Journal of The American Institute of Planners, Vol. 35 (March 1969), p. 96.

14. Ibid., p. 96.

15. Ibid., p. 96.

16. See BCC School Construction Plan, no date.

17. Research proposal submitted to National Institute of Mental Health by Brownsville Community Council. "Experiment in Community Planning by an Active Ghetto," March 4, 1968, p. 37.

18. Ibid., p. 37.

19. See BCC School Construction Plan, no date.

20. Walter Thabit, "An Alternate Plan for Cooper Square" (New York: Cooper Square Community Development Committee and Businessmen's Association, 1961).

21. Ibid.

22. Paul Davidoff, "Suburban Action: Advocate Planning for an Open Society," Journal of The American Institute of Planners, Vol. 36 (January 1970), p. 12.

23. Dr. Frances Piven. "Advocacy as a Strategy of Political Management," Perspectra, Vol. 1237, 1969, p. 37.

24. Bernard J. Frieden, "Toward Equality of Urban Opportunity," Journal of The American Institute of Planners, Vol. 31 (November) 1965, p. 320.

25. Ibid.

26. Op. cit., "Experiment in Community Planning by an Active Ghetto," p. 37.

27. See abstract prepared by Advocate Planners in Brownsville Project for publication in Quarterly Digest of Urban and Regional Research, September 29, 1970.

28. Matthew Meade, Summary Progress Report of Advocacy Planning Unit to Board of Directors of Brownsville Community Council, May 21, 1970.

29. Paul Cooper, "General Budget Review," February 19, 1970.

30. A communication from the Advocacy Planning Unit staff of July 20, 1970, reacting to statement of agreement prepared by Center for Urban Education on July 11, 1970, after a combined meeting (Brownsville Community Council, Center for Urban Education, and National Institute of Mental Health) for the purpose of reaching an agreement as to roles, responsibilities, and procedures.

CHAPTER II

1. William Morris, ed., The American Heritage Dictionary of the English Language (New York and Boston: American Heritage Publishing Company, Inc., and Houghton Mifflin Company, 1969).

2. See interim report to National Institute of Mental Health from Center for Urban Education, June 5, 1969.

3. Research Proposal submitted to National Institute of Mental Health by Brownsville Community Council. "Experiment in Community Planning by an Active Ghetto," p. 17.

4. See abstract prepared by Advocate Planners in Brownsville Project for publication in Quarterly Digest of Urban and Regional Research, September 20, 1970.

5. Matthew Meade, Summary Progress Report of Advocacy Planning Unit to Board of Directors of Brownsville Community Council, May 21, 1970.

6. Ibid.

7. Paul Cooper, "General Budget Review," February 19, 1970.

8. Op. cit., "Experiment in Community Planning by an Active Ghetto," p. 17.

9. Ibid.

CHAPTER IV

1. See Advocacy Planning Program Review of program year F, July 10, 1970.

2. Ibid.

3. Matthew Meade, Report to Board of Directors of Brownsville Community Council, May 12, 1971.

4. Ibid.

5. Matthew Meade, Progress Report #2 to Board of Directors of Brownsville Community Council, September 7, 1969.

6. Ibid.

7. Ibid.

8. Ibid.

9. See BCC educational campaign material, no date.

10. Matthew Meade, Summary Progress Report to Board of Directors of Brownsville Community Council, May 21, 1970. Special Communications: Brownsville Community Council Executive Director: "Brookdale Hospital Crisis," February 2, 1970.

11. Ibid.

12. Ibid.

13. Ibid.

14. Ibid.

15. Year F General Funding Principles and Conditions. Community Development Association, May 15, 1970.

16. Ibid.

17. Matthew Meade to Board: Presentation on Brownsville Cultural Arts Program, October 26, 1970.

18. See Advocacy Planning Program Review of program year F, July 10, 1970.

19. Ibid.

20. Ibid.

21. Progress Report on Proposed Brownsville Central Buyers Club, June 10, 1970.

22. See Advocacy Planning Program Review of program year F, July 10, 1970.

23. Ibid.

24. See Advocacy Planning Program Review of program year G, May 1971.

25. Ibid.

26. Ibid.

27. Ibid.

28. Ibid.

29. "A Proposal on Occupational Health Programs," no date.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

PROGRESS REPORT: ADVOCACY PLANNING

Brownsville Community Council

Research Study

by

James W. Elsbery

May 31, 1971

PROGRESS REPORT: ADVOCACY PLANNING
Brownsville Community Council
Research Study

Introduction

The Center for Urban Education has for the six years of its existence directed its resources to the research and evaluation of social systems within the urban setting. It has consistently been concerned with developing ways in which people may accomplish their community aims and goals within the prescribed framework of a democratic and pluralistic society.

This report indicates some of the necessary changes that have taken place in the initial research of this study as well as the accomplishments, findings, and work still to be completed.

Although Advocacy Planning has been conceived mainly as a way of achieving community aims and goals through pressure but within the norms of the societal structure, the effect of such planned social change has been widely questioned, particularly its impact upon the immediate community, the wider social system, or both. The importance of this question led the Center for Urban Education to undertake an evaluation of the Advocacy Planning Program in Brownsville, Brooklyn. A broader question to which our final report addresses itself is whether we can duplicate successful change in the major cities across this nation.

"Social change," as used here, refers to any of the social institutions to which planners direct their attention ("social" is used in its broadest sociological meaning). One planner may focus on health sercies, another on housing, another on education or on all of these, as well as others unnamed.

In the area of mental health, consistent with practices of the National Institute of Mental Health, we have given the broadest possible interpretation to the term. We perceive that what happens in the areas of education, housing, and recreation to be factors affecting mental health. We conceptualize "mental health" as a gestalt, a sum total of those factors that directly impinge upon one's ability to say: "I perceive myself as having options with regard to solving the problems of living and perceive myself as having some control over those options which permit entrances into all major arteries of the socio-political systems of which I am or care to be a member." These options would relate to such institutions as the family, formal education, politics, and economics.

Methodology Problems

In this light, the question raised earlier may be stated as: In what way can universal statements be made about the performance of Advocacy Planning as one alternative in the arsenal of planned social change that would result in positive, valid and reliable change in the socio-mental health conditions of a community? To answer such a question one must establish a series of benchmarks by which to evaluate performance. We call these markers "indicators" that are as often as possible quantifiable. We accept without apology or embarrassment the fact that some indicators are presently "non-quantifiable."

We maintain that "community research" requires new approaches, methods and instruments. Many existing assumptions must be retested

and not assumptions posited. In this field one is working with relatively unstable factors: an inner city community is ever changing; in and out migration, ethnic composition, socio-economic shifts - these are but a few pertinent examples. Within a community, especially one in the inner city, it is difficult, if not impossible, to establish control groups or set up procedures without community involvement. No longer can one (if one ever should have) work in a community the way researchers used college students in psychology classes for purposes of experimentation. For these reasons alone new methods have to be created. The limited information that currently exists about communities in any systemwide sense indicates the miniscule amount of applicable research that has been done. This lack reflects the fact that some of the existing instruments are often unreliable, inaccurate, or too specific for general use. Such a situation explains the approach taken by the Center's research of this problem. The Center is hopeful that a spinoff of this project may well be the conceptualization of a model for examining ongoing planned phenomena in an urban setting.

In addition to the reason already noted, there are certain contaminating factors which make it basically impossible to do a "clean" cause and effect research design and evaluation study of "Advocacy Planning in the Brownsville Community." The number of variables that affect human behavior outside of a specific artificially established environment are too numerous for our present methodology and too interlocking for even such techniques as partial correlation. What must always be kept in view is that we are dealing with the human animal

and, in this instance, a particular human animal with very specific needs, rights and demands which he is capable of imposing upon the researcher. The question we wish to answer is: "Does Advocacy Planning have a significant positive value for inner city communities, with specific emphasis on its effect upon improving the mental health of a community?"

Methodology Employed

The intent of our methodology is to avoid statistical mumbo-jumbo, to employ data and statistics that illuminate rather than confuse, and to utilize qualitative information wherever it is appropriate and reliable and valid on some measurable scale. The method to be employed throughout this study is essentially socio-historical events leading up to this event. Comparative analysis is also employed: what are the patent and latent goals, to what degree were the goals achieved; what difference, if any, is there between what Brownsville Community Council accomplished or attempted to accomplish before and after the creation of an Advocacy Planning unit; to what degree, if at all, can any found differences be attributed to Advocacy Planning. Comparison between the goals and needs of the professional planners and Brownsville Community Council and the community's perception of goals and needs will be performed where possible; behavioral changes will be noted and explained; system changes and their effects will be both recorded and explained.

The following nine topical headings further clarify what the final report will contain and the analysis to be employed:

1. History of Advocacy Planning.
2. History of Brownsville Community Council Advocacy Planning.
3. The prescribed goals of Advocacy Planning Program on the part of its creators: Brownsville Community Council, Inc., National Institute of Mental Health, and Advocacy Planning Project.
4. Demography of the community at project's inception and at present.
5. Formal and informal structure and communication between Brownsville Community Council and Advocacy Planning Project. Formal and informal ties and community (power) between B.C.C. and agencies and institutions outside the community. Formal and informal ties and communication between Advocacy Planning Programs and agencies and institutions outside the community.
6. Actual and potential power lines between or among B.C.C., Advocacy Planning and other agencies.
7. Role: Performance and achievement of Advocacy Planning.
8. Potential value of Advocacy Planning in Brownsville Community Council in light of preceding seven topics.
9. Epilogue: Potential value of Advocacy Planning from what has been learned.

Accomplishments

The Center for Urban Education's evaluation of the Brownsville Community Council's Advocacy Planning Project officially began in June 1968; however, actual full-time work began in April 1969 (see pages 1

and 2 of Progress Report). The final evaluation report will be delivered November 1971 to the National Institute of Mental Health. The evaluation phase of the Advocacy Planning Project has been carried out by two assistants (reporters) and a project director.

An initial bibliographical review of advocacy planning has been performed with special emphasis upon determining whether or not there has been any change in the perceived intent of advocacy planning and the techniques to be employed in carrying it out. Early analysis indicates that there has been a change in the personnel selected for advocacy planning as well as in the methods or techniques to be used in carrying it out. Advocacy planning is not new in concept, but as a profession it is quite recent. The utilization of professional advocacy planning on the part of such victims of prejudice as the poor and non-whites is comparatively new; advocacy planning as employed by federal or state agencies on their behalf is a unique innovation. It is a development that may well be directly related to the growing political and economic power of these groups and their increased social awareness. It is possible that evidence will indicate that these innovations are directly related to keeping the actions of these groups within the norms of the social system rather than in direct confrontation with the system.

Present data indicate that advocacy planning has not been fully tried for any extended period with a built-in evaluative methodology to indicate its overall effectiveness. Therefore, we must conclude that it has not failed anywhere because it has not been fully tested anywhere. Here we are referring to advocacy planning as employed in inner cities

for the benefit of the poor and/or non-white.

The information gathered to date that refers to the second topical heading of the final report also permits some preliminary conclusions. Advocacy planning came into Brownsville for an extended period after an existing community agency had established working ties within and without the community with the political and financial power lines that had determined what Brownsville Community Council proposals would and would not be funded. The internal formal and informal organizational structure had already been created and had become entrenched. The addition of a new unit meant establishing or altering some of the existing lines of communication, with a resulting perception of loss in power for some parts of the organization. There already existed a planning division or unit, which had submitted recommendations regarding funding proposals to the executive director and the board of directors of the Brownsville Community Council. The distinction would have to be made between Advocacy Planning and the work that this division had been doing if cooperative relations were to be established. This is clear from the data, which include memoranda, letters, minutes and interview statements. What is equally clear is that while initial suspicions existed the development of a cooperative working relationship between the two groups is also rapidly growing.

The limited evidence would seem to indicate, however, that the Advocacy Planning Unit had given more attention to answering questions passed to it by Brownsville Community Council and to determining for itself the needs of the community than to strong behavioral commitment

to determine from the community at large what it perceives as the major needs and priorities. However, this statement must be understood in the light of the political and administrative structure of the Brownsville Community Council. The Brownsville Community Council has an exceptionally wide community base rather than a tight pyramidal one and, therefore, it well may be that the Advocacy Planning unit has employed the members of the council and board as its sounding board for community needs and priorities rather than going directly to the people. It is also noted that the Advocacy Planning unit is administratively so tied to BCC that it has little if any ability to establish its own aims, goals and methodology without BCC approval. Further study will determine the correctness of this position and its effect upon the achievement of the planned objectives. It should be noted that the Advocacy Planning unit does not directly list among its primary objectives educating people to determine and effectively articulate their needs and demands. The objectives are within the narrowly prescribed area of determining needs and demands and effectively articulating them for the community or community agency. This is the way that advocacy planning has for the most part been utilized.

The data make it apparent that the executive director and the board of directors of Brownsville Community Council do perceive the Advocacy Planning unit as beneficial. But that data also indicate that they have not fully tested the abilities or possibilities of this unit. The reasons for this may lie within the general ignorance that most of us have regarding the potential use of advocacy planning as well as because of problems within the structure of the parent organization and its leadership. It is currently believed that the answer is with

the former possibility. Further research will clarify this issue for us. A third possibility that is being investigated is that the unit itself has not fully educated the board as to how it can be utilized fully. The obvious fourth conclusion is that the answer will prove to be some combination of these possibilities.

We have completed our initial demographic study of the five areas making up the Brownsville community. We have found the area characterized by high population density, largely non-white in-migration and white exodus, poverty, extreme housing dilapidation, inadequate health and recreation facilities and services, below national reading and arithmetic achievement norms in its public schools, high unemployment and a high rate of narcotic addiction. A 1971 survey reaching some 718 community persons indicated that they perceived that their basic priorities were ordered in the following way: housing; drug addiction; health; manpower-employment; education. Comparing the priorities listed with the projects submitted by Brownsville Community Council and funded, we find a high correlation between what the surveyed areas of Brownsville perceived their needs to be and the funded projects. In the order of amount of funding the projects were related to the following: education; housing; manpower-employment; health.[1] What is still to be determined is the total number of requests, the areas, and the amounts. What can be stated at this point is that the Community Council is responding to community perceived needs. What is of vital importance,

---

[1] Brownsville Community Council, Inc., Brownsville Community Survey Analysis, March 1971.

however, is to determine the effect, if any, that such an awareness on the part of the community has upon the mental health of the people as defined earlier in this report.

Applicability To Other Urban Settings

Some generalized statements can be made at this time. Many urban communities are establishing some form of community agencies through which city, state, and federal funds are funnelled into the community for specified projects. Model Cities programs exist in many of the major cities throughout this nation. In both instances it is apparent that the purpose is to give the people of the community the means to communicate their needs and to see something done about them. Whether or not the latent intent is to prevent riots, win votes, or relieve the pressure of self determination on local, state or federal governments is not the issue. To the degree that its perceived needs are dealt with, the community will perceive that it has options, limited as these may be.

Evidence indicates that this perception is a crucial factor in the prevention of urban riots.[2] If we interpret riots as reactions to intolerable presure, whatever the source, then this is a negative ntal health factor. To be able to give a community the feeling that its needs, to some major degree, are being met and their rights maintained provides what can readily be called a sense of community mental health. Such provision should also be looked at as preventive medicine for it deals with the life style and needs of

[2]Robert A. Dentler, and James W. Elsbery, THE NEGRO IN THE AMERICAN CITY: TWO STUDIES IN PLANNED CHANGE (Center for Urban Education) pp. 41-43.

a people before the onset of community illness. Advocacy Planning can thus assist in the development or maintenance of the community's mental health. What has happened in Brooklyn indicates that. We have seen that advocacy planning can reliably tap the community's thinking as to its needs and articulate them in professional terms to its own agency, be it a Model City or a Community Council. Perception of control of one's life style is important to mental health. Where a citizen does not have that control but believes that his elected officials do, gives him a sense of control through representative government. Advocacy Planning can offer this to people when it is coupled, as in Brooklyn, with a professional community organization that is legitimate in the eyes of both its community constituents and the local, state and/or federal political-economic institutions. The study made of the formal and informal structure of Brownsville Community Council reveals that it has an exceptionally wide community base. Its meetings are public. Its board of directors is both elected by the people at large and a few members are selected by those elected. The community agencies of the area are all represented as well as those non-agency affiliated. The Brownsville area is broken down into districts with representation from all five. The sums of money funnelled to all five is approximately equal. As indicated earlier, the major needs as seen by the community are being reported, projects developed, funds requested and, in most instances, funds granted.

It appears at this stage of our study that as long as the major agency to which advocacy planning is attached is believed to be responsive to the community and receives financial support from the more

distant and often distrusted local and political government bodies, then the community is in a healthier frame of mind. Recently a Black youth shot a policeman in front of a grocery store. There was a crowd of people standing by. They saw the incident, chased the assailant, caught him, beat him and only then turned him over to the police. This is an unusual incident for any urban area. It would appear to be even more unusual when one notes the city to be New York, Kings County, Black, low socio-economic neighborhood. The policeman was white, the assailant a Black youth, the owner of the store white and the crowd Black, the time, summer. These are generally the ingredients for riot or at the very least a time for aiding the attacker. The community was Brownsville. It is not possible to prove at this point any cause and effect between the sense of options and sense of community action and responsibility that advocacy planning has helped bring about, but sufficient cases like or somewhat similar to this have been occurring.

To perceive that law enforcement agencies are to be supported in low socio-economic Black inner city communities has been more often a wish than a practice. For community persons to apprehend a felon and turn him over to the police is unusual in any urban community today. It well may be that these actions and others represent a growing healthy feeling that existing institutions are for these Blacks as well and, therefore, they protect that which they perceive to be beneficial to them. A survey we are in the process of doing will answer some of the questions both implicit and explicit in this recounted happening. It

is to be remembered that incidents of driving off firemen from putting out fires have not been reported, but preliminary discussions with firemen indicate that a change had taken place. They see a possible swing upward, but that may be due to the rising unemployment rate that has hit New York City, especially Black low socio-economic areas and Black youth in particular.

These would be fundamental health changes if proved valid. The effect of an advocacy planning unit to professionally articulate community needs and tap community perception of its needs would be a vital link in this health chain. We are examining to see if in fact Brownsville Advocacy Planning is performing this function resulting in these effects. If such is the case, the importance of advocacy planning, when properly employed, is worthy of major political and financial support. We are also determining what "properly" means. We hope to establish some minimum set of guidelines.

The above generalizations have not referred to improved mental and physical health conditions in the area. This point has been left until last because it is the most obvious and in fact may have more immediate appeal to the National Institute of Mental Health but less long lasting effect upon the people in the community. It is maintained that the evidence indicates that a sense of freedom or options is more important to mental health than just improved hospital, doctor and mental health facilities. It well may be that Advocacy Planning must conceptualize its primary goals, give them priority ordering and function accordingly. The Brownsville Community Council Advocacy/Planning unit has

made efforts in the mental and physical health areas but as yet we have not been able to judge their full effectiveness. It is believed that some proportion, if not balance, should be established between the National Institute of Mental Health-established Advocacy Planning units working in the area of improved community physical and mental health facilities and resources and the efforts of such units for assisting the community to expand its general options for survival, be they housing, recreation, or political power.

APPENDIX B

ADVOCACY PLANNING STUDY
Brownsville Community Council

Questionnaire

This is an interview to help us better understand the effectiveness of the Brownsville Community Council (BCC) and its Advocacy Planning Unit (AP). The information you are giving us will be used in an evaluation report for the Federal Government. Your icentity, however, will be kept confidential.

Fire Department

1. Have you noticed any changes at all in the community within the last three years? (Changes related to functioning in community of Fire Department.)

2. Are people more or less receptive to your presence in the community?

   Why do you think this is so?

3. Have you heard of the Brownsville Community Council?

4. Do you think that having the BCC has helped the community?

   How?

5. Have you heard of the Advocacy Planning Unit?

6. Has Advocacy Planning helped the community?

   How ?

7. Within the last two years--has there been an increase or decrease in the number of fires?

   False alarms?

8. Has BCC had any effect upon the number of fires?

   False alarms?

   Receptiveness in the community?

   How?

9. Has AP had any effect upon the number of fires?

   False alarms?

   Receptiveness of the community?

   How?

10. Where do you live?

11. Level of education?

12. Age?

13. Years on force?

14. Years working in the community?

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Abstract prepared by Advocate Planners in Brownsville Project for publication in Quarterly Digest of Urban and Regional Research. September 20, 1970.

Cooper, Paul. General Budget Review. February 19, 1970.

Davidoff, Paul. "Advocacy and Pluralism in Planning." Journal of The American Institute of Planners, Vol. 31 (November 1965).

Davidoff, Paul. "Suburban Action: Advocate Planning for an Open Society." Journal of The American Institute of Planners, Vol. 36 (January 1970).

Frieden, Bernard J. "Toward Equality of Urban Opportunity." Journal of The American Institute of Planners, Vol. 31 (November 1965).

Funaye, Clarence. "Whom Does the Advocate Planner Serve? The Advocate Planner as an Urban Hustler." Social Policy, July-August 1970.

Hartman, Chester W. "Whom Does the Advocate Planner Serve? From Hired Gun to Political Partisan." Social Policy, July-August 1970.

Hatch, C. Richard. "Some Thoughts on Advocacy Planning." Architectural Forum, Vol. 128 (June 1968).

Kaplan, Marshall. "Advocacy and the Poor." Journal of The American Institute of Planners, Vol. 35 (March 1969).

Meade, Matthew. Summary Progress Report of Advocacy Planning Unit to Board of Directors of Brownsville Community Council, May 21, 1970.

Peattie, Lisa. "Reflection on Advocacy Planning." Journal of The American Institute of Planners, Vol. 34 (March 1968).

Piven, Dr. Francis. "Advocacy as a Strategy of Political Management." Perspectra (Yale Architectural Magazine), Vol. 1237 (1969).

Research proposal submitted to National Institute of Mental Health by Brownsville Community Council. "Experiment in Community Planning by an Active Ghetto," March 4, 1968.

Thabit, Walter. "An Alternate Plan for Cooper Square." New York Cooper Square Community Development Committee and Businessmen's Association, 1961.